



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,530	06/24/2003	Kimihide Takahashi	Q76183	9526
23373 7590 06/20/2007 SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			EXAMINER MADDEN, GREGORY VINCENT	
			ART UNIT 2622	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/20/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/601,530	Applicant(s) TAKAHASHI, KIMIHIIDE	
	Examiner Gregory V. Madden	Art Unit 2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed April 24, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

First, in regard to claims 1, 2, 9, and 12, the Applicant has amended the claims to include the limitation of “a removable cradle”, and the Applicant contends that the claim is patentable over Nishimura for this reason. While the Examiner agrees that the Nishimura reference does not specifically teach a “removable” cradle, the Applicant's arguments are considered moot in view of a new ground of rejection citing Nishimura in view of Ganthier et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,081,422). Please refer to the new ground of rejection to claims 1, 2, 9, and 12 below.

Next, regarding claim 2, the Applicant argues that Nishimura teaches that the support base 73, relied upon by the Examiner to teach the cradle, is stationary, and thus cannot comprise a moveable portion as claimed. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. While Nishimura does state that the support base 73 is stationary in Col. 4, Lines 28-32, Nishimura also teaches lens block holding member 711 enables the lens block 72 to be rotatably journaled, as is taught in Col. 4, Lines 61-63. As the lens block holding member is located within the support base 73, the Examiner believes that Nishimura does in fact teach the cradle comprising a movable portion, as claimed by the Applicant. Further, the Applicant argues that Nishimura only teaches that the settings of zoom and the settings of auto focus are changed according to the position of the movable portion, not that a function of the digital camera are changed based on the position of the movable portion. Again, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Both zoom and auto focus are “functions” of a digital camera, and by changing the settings for zoom and auto focus solely on the position of the movable means (i.e. changing the settings when switched from person pickup mode to document pickup mode), a “function” of the digital camera is changed. The Examiner

Art Unit: 2622

interprets functions of the digital camera to be any operation within the digital camera, thereby including zoom and auto focus as functions. For the above reasons, the rejection to claim 2 is maintained, as will be set forth below.

As for claim 5, the Applicant alleges that the Nishimura reference fails to teach that the movable system enables the camera mounting unit to move relative to the leg portion, and specifically points to Col. 4, Lines 61-64 to show that the bearing parts 711a (cited by the Examiner) are stationary. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The bearing parts 711a enable the lens block holding member 711 to rotate with lens block 72, thereby teaching that the bearing parts are not stationary, as there is rotation (via shafts 722) (See Col. 4, Line 57 – Col. 5, Line 3). For this reason, the Examiner believes that Nishimura sufficiently teaches that the movable system enables the camera mounting unit (711a) to move relative to the leg portion (71), and the rejection of claim 5 is maintained.

Next, considering claim 7, the Applicant contends that Nishimura fails to disclose that the digital camera communicates with the external equipment in any way. Again, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Col. 5, Lines 30-33 teach that signal cables are attached to the cradle at rear part 73b to communicate with external units, and Col. 6, Lines 18-20 teach that an image signal from the digital camera (i.e. from CCD processing part 724) is delivered to the monitor (1). As such, the Examiner believes that Nishimura does teach that the digital camera communicates with the monitor, and the rejection to claim 7 is maintained.

In regard to claim 9, as is similarly shown above with respect to claim 2, the Applicant argues that the changing of auto focus and zoom settings do not correspond to the changing of the operation mode of the camera. However, by changing the settings for zoom and auto focus solely on the position of the movable means (i.e. changing the settings when switched from person pickup mode to document pickup mode), an “operation mode” of the digital camera is changed. The Examiner interprets operation modes of the digital camera to be any operation within the digital camera, thereby including zoom and

Art Unit: 2622

auto focus as operation modes. For the above reasons, the rejection to claim 9 is maintained, as will be set forth below.

Finally, it is noted that the Applicant has added new dependent claims 13-21. Please refer to the rejection to the new claims set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 and 12-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishimura et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,734,414) in view of Ganthier et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,081,422).

First, regarding **claim 1**, the Nishimura reference teaches a digital camera system comprising a digital camera (lens block 72) and a cradle (support base 73) on which the digital camera is mounted, wherein the cradle comprises a movable portion (lens block holding member 711), a signal generating device (main control part 734) which generates a command signal for changing functions (such as the zooming control) of the digital camera according to a position of the moveable portion (e.g. the tilt angle), and a signal transmitting device (main control part 734) which transmits the command signal generated by the signal generating device to the digital camera. Further, Nishimura teaches that the digital camera comprises a signal receiving device (AF and Zooming circuit part 725) which receives the command signal generated according to the position of the movable portion of the cradle, and a mode control device (725) which changes operation modes of the digital camera according to the command signal transmitted from the cradle. Please refer to Figs. 3A, 5, and 6, Col. 4, Lines 26-55, and Col. 6, Line 62 – Col. 7, Line

Art Unit: 2622

54. What Nishimura fails to disclose is that the cradle (support base 73) is a removable cradle. However, noting the Ganthier reference, Ganthier teaches a digital camera (camera 200) and a removable cradle (base 102), wherein the cradle is removed from computer monitor 300 (See Fig. 7, Col. 3, Line 59 - Col. 4, Line 2, and Col. 5, Lines 44-56). Note also that camera 200 is removable from the cradle (102) in Fig. 2. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the removable cradle feature of Ganthier with the cradle and camera system of Nishimura. One would have been motivated to do so because it is advantageous to securely mount a camera to the top of a monitor, as Ganthier teaches in Col. 2, Lines 14-24, and it is equally advantageous to have the ability to use the camera and cradle on other devices (such as monitors), thus saving the user from having to equip all external devices with a digital camera and cradle.

As for **claim 2**, Nishimura discloses a cradle (support base 73) on which a digital camera (lens block 72) is mounted, the cradle comprising a movable portion (lens block holding member 711), a signal generating device (main control part 734) which generates a command signal for changing functions of the digital camera (such as the zooming control) according to a position of the moveable portion (e.g. the tilt angle), and a signal transmitting device (main control part 734) which transmits the command signal generated by the signal generating device to the digital camera. Please refer again to Figs. 3A, 5, and 6, Col. 4, Lines 26-55, and Col. 6, Line 62 – Col. 7, Line 54. Once again, what Nishimura fails to disclose is that the cradle (support base 73) is a removable cradle. However, noting the Ganthier reference, Ganthier teaches a digital camera (camera 200) and a removable cradle (base 102), wherein the cradle is removed from computer monitor 300 (See Fig. 7, Col. 3, Line 59 - Col. 4, Line 2, and Col. 5, Lines 44-56). Note also that camera 200 is removable from the cradle (102) in Fig. 2. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the removable cradle feature of Ganthier with the cradle and camera system of Nishimura. One would have been motivated to do so because it is advantageous to securely mount a camera to the top of a monitor, as

Art Unit: 2622

Ganthier teaches in Col. 2, Lines 14-24, and it is equally advantageous to have the ability to use the camera and cradle on other devices (such as monitors), thus saving the user from having to equip all external devices with a digital camera and cradle.

Considering **claim 3**, the Nishimura reference teaches the limitations of claim 2 above, and Nishimura further teaches that the movable portion (lens block holding member 711) comprises a camera mounting unit (bearing parts 711a) on which the digital camera (72) is mounted. Please refer to Col. 4, Lines 61-64 and Fig. 3a.

In regard to **claim 4**, the limitations of claim 3 are taught above, and Nishimura also discloses that the cradle comprises a leg portion (camera unit body 71) which supports the camera mounting unit, wherein the camera mounting unit (711a) is coupled to the leg portion (71) through a movable system. Please refer again to Fig. 3a and Col. 4, Lines 26-64.

Next, regarding **claim 5**, the limitations of claim 4 are taught above, and Nishimura teaches that the movable system allows enables the camera mounting unit (711a) to move relatively to the leg portion (71) (e.g. the camera mounting unit tilts the digital camera relative to the leg portion), wherein the moving style of the camera mounting unit is tilting with respect to the leg portion. See Figs. 1-3a, Col. 4, Lines 26-55, and Col. 6, Line 62 – Col. 7, Line 54.

As for **claim 6**, the limitations of claim 5 are taught above, and Nishimura discloses in Col. 7, Lines 36-54 that the movable system enables the movable portion (lens block holding member 711) to move in a predetermined moving range.

Considering **claim 7**, the limitations of claim 2 are taught above, and the cradle of Nishimura further comprises a communications interface (73c) for connection and communications with external equipment (e.g. monitor 1), wherein the digital camera is connected to communicate with the external equipment through the cradle by mounting the digital camera on the cradle. Please refer to Figs. 3a, 5, and 6, and Col. 5, Lines 30-34.

Regarding **claim 8**, the limitations of claim 7 are set forth above, and Nishimura also teaches that the signal generating device (main control part 734) generates a signal (based on the output from tilt sensor 714) for switching functions of the digital camera for the external equipment (monitor 1) connected for communications through the cradle. See Figs. 3a, 5, and 6, and Col. 7, Lines 25-54.

Next, in regard to **claim 9**, the Nishimura reference teaches a digital camera (lens block 72) capable of being mounted on a cradle (support base 73), wherein the the digital camera comprises a signal receiving device (AF and Zooming circuit part 725) which receives the command signal generated according to the position of the movable portion of the cradle, and a mode control device (725) which changes operation modes of the digital camera according to the command signal transmitted from the cradle. Please refer to Figs. 3A, 5, and 6, Col. 4, Lines 26-55, and Col. 6, Line 62 – Col. 7, Line 54. Once again, what Nishimura fails to disclose is that the cradle (support base 73) is a removable cradle. However, noting the Ganthier reference, Ganthier teaches a digital camera (camera 200) and a removable cradle (base 102), wherein the cradle is removed from computer monitor 300 (See Fig. 7, Col. 3, Line 59 - Col. 4, Line 2, and Col. 5, Lines 44-56). Note also that camera 200 is removable from the cradle (102) in Fig. 2. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the removable cradle feature of Ganthier with the cradle and camera system of Nishimura. One would have been motivated to do so because it is advantageous to securely mount a camera to the top of a monitor, as Ganthier teaches in Col. 2, Lines 14-24, and it is equally advantageous to have the ability to use the camera and cradle on other devices (such as monitors), thus saving the user from having to equip all external devices with a digital camera and cradle.

As for **claim 10**, the limitations of claim 9 are taught above by Nishimura in view of Ganthier, and Nishimura further teaches that the operations modes are changed according to the command signal (based on the output from tilt sensor 714) while the digital camera (72) is mounted on the cradle and powered up (via power source 734a). See Fig. 3a and Col. 6, Line 62 – Col. 7, Line 54.

Considering **claim 12**, Nishimura teaches a digital camera system in which a digital camera (72) is connected to communicate with external equipment (monitor 1) when the camera is mounted on a cradle (73), wherein the cradle comprises a tilt angle changing device (tilt motor 712, and tilt drive transmission gear 713) that changes the tilt angle of a camera, a determination device (tilt sensor 714) which determines a change in the tilt angle of the digital camera by the tilt angle changing device, and a command device (main control part 734) which outputs a function change signal (i.e. document pick-up position or pick-up of a personal subject) to the digital camera according to the determination result (or tilt angle) of the determination device (tilt sensor 714). See Figs. 3a and 5, and Col. 7, Lines 24-50. Once again, what Nishimura fails to disclose is that the cradle (support base 73) is a removable cradle. However, noting the Ganthier reference, Ganthier teaches a digital camera (camera 200) and a removable cradle (base 102), wherein the cradle is removed from computer monitor 300 (See Fig. 7, Col. 3, Line 59 - Col. 4, Line 2, and Col. 5, Lines 44-56). Note also that camera 200 is removable from the cradle (102) in Fig. 2. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the removable cradle feature of Ganthier with the cradle and camera system of Nishimura. One would have been motivated to do so because it is advantageous to securely mount a camera to the top of a monitor, as Ganthier teaches in Col. 2, Lines 14-24, and it is equally advantageous to have the ability to use the camera and cradle on other devices (such as monitors), thus saving the user from having to equip all external devices with a digital camera and cradle.

Next, in regard to **claim 13**, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above by Nishimura in view of Ganthier, and the Nishimura reference further teaches that the operation modes comprise a camera mode (i.e. a person pick-up mode) and a non-camera mode (i.e. document pick-up mode), wherein it is considered that the "camera mode" is the mode in which the camera is picking up an image of a user. Thus, any mode that is not the "camera mode" can be considered a "non-camera mode". Please refer to Col. 3, Lines 33-36.

As for **claim 14**, the limitations of claim 13 are taught above, and while Nishimura does teach that the camera mode comprises a PC camera mode (i.e. the images captured in the person pick-up mode are displayed on monitor 1, as taught in Col. 4, Lines 37-41), Nishimura fails to specifically disclose that the non-camera mode (document pick-up mode) comprises a storage mode. However, Official Notice is hereby taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated a storage mode with the document pick-up mode of Nishimura, as it would be advantageous to not only view the captured documents on monitor 1, but to also save the captured images of the documents for subsequent viewing and/or processing. Such a configuration would provide for an archive of the electronic conference events.

Considering **claim 15**, the limitations of claim 14 are set forth above, and again the Nishimura reference teaches that in the PC camera mode the digital camera functions as a PC camera (see Col. 4, Lines 37-41). What Nishimura fails to specifically disclose is that in a storage mode, the digital camera functions as a cardreader. However, Official Notice is again taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have a digital camera function as a cardreader in a storage mode, as such a configuration allows captured images saved within the digital camera to be provided to an external device (e.g. monitor 1 or a PC) for subsequent viewing and/or processing. This configuration would provide for an archive of the electronic conference events.

Next, regarding **claim 16**, the limitations of claim 2 are taught above by Nishimura in view of Ganthier, and the Nishimura reference further teaches that the functions of the digital camera comprise a camera function (i.e. a person pick-up mode) and a non-camera function (i.e. document pick-up mode), wherein it is considered that the “camera mode” is the function in which the camera is picking up an image of a user. Thus, any function that is not the “camera function” can be considered a “non-camera function”. Please refer to Col. 3, Lines 33-36.

As for **claim 17**, the limitations of claim 16 are taught above, and while Nishimura does teach that the camera function comprises a PC camera function (i.e. the images captured in the person pick-up mode are displayed on monitor 1, as taught in Col. 4, Lines 37-41), Nishimura fails to specifically disclose that the non-camera function (document pick-up mode) comprises a storage function. However, Official Notice is hereby taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated a storage function with the document pick-up mode of Nishimura, as it would be advantageous to not only view the captured documents on monitor 1, but to also save the captured images of the documents for subsequent viewing and/or processing. Such a configuration would provide for an archive of the electronic conference events.

Next, in regard to **claim 18**, the limitations of claim 9 are taught above by Nishimura in view of Ganthier, and the Nishimura reference further teaches that the operation modes comprise a camera mode (i.e. a person pick-up mode) and a non-camera mode (i.e. document pick-up mode), wherein it is considered that the “camera mode” is the mode in which the camera is picking up an image of a user. Thus, any mode that is not the “camera mode” can be considered a “non-camera mode”. Please refer to Col. 3, Lines 33-36.

As for **claim 19**, the limitations of claim 18 are taught above, and while Nishimura does teach that the camera mode comprises a PC camera mode (i.e. the images captured in the person pick-up mode are displayed on monitor 1, as taught in Col. 4, Lines 37-41), Nishimura fails to specifically disclose that the non-camera mode (document pick-up mode) comprises a storage mode. However, Official Notice is hereby taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated a storage mode with the document pick-up mode of Nishimura, as it would be advantageous to not only view the captured documents on monitor 1, but to also save the captured images of the documents for subsequent viewing and/or processing. Such a configuration would provide for an archive of the electronic conference events.

Next, regarding **claim 20**, the limitations of claim 12 are taught above by Nishimura in view of Ganthier, and the Nishimura reference further teaches that the functions of the digital camera comprise a camera function (i.e. a person pick-up mode) and a non-camera function (i.e. document pick-up mode), wherein it is considered that the “camera mode” is the function in which the camera is picking up an image of a user. Thus, any function that is not the “camera function” can be considered a “non-camera function”. Please refer to Col. 3, Lines 33-36.

Finally, as for **claim 21**, the limitations of claim 20 are taught above, and while Nishimura does teach that the camera function comprises a PC camera function (i.e. the images captured in the person pick-up mode are displayed on monitor 1, as taught in Col. 4, Lines 37-41), Nishimura fails to specifically disclose that the non-camera function (document pick-up mode) comprises a storage function. However, Official Notice is hereby taken that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated a storage function with the document pick-up mode of Nishimura, as it would be advantageous to not only view the captured documents on monitor 1, but to also save the captured images of the documents for subsequent viewing and/or processing. Such a configuration would provide for an archive of the electronic conference events.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 11 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding **claim 11**, the prior art fails to teach or reasonably suggest, in combination with the limitations of Applicant’s claim 9, a digital camera comprising a charge control device which, when the

Art Unit: 2622

digital camera is mounted on the cradle with the digital camera being powered down, automatically sets a charge mode where a battery in the digital camera is charged by power supplied through the camera.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Nagaoka (U.S. Pat. 6,734,915): Note in Fig. 7 that the direction that the digital camera is mounted in the camera determines whether the digital camera acts as a PC camera or a card reader/writer.

Gotoh et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,966,164)

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory V. Madden whose telephone number is 571-272-8128. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8AM-5PM.

Art Unit: 2622

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ngoc Yen Vu can be reached on 571-272-7320. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gregory Madden
June 4, 2007



NGOCYEN VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER